

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending.

Claims 1-10 and 17-19 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Matsumoto et al. (US Patent No. 6,373,598).

Matsumoto is directed to a fax machine using a computer as a local storage with a service support connection that allows the application software of the fax machine to be updated. The fax service of Matsumoto is not a centralized *fax* service used for fax transactions, it is a support service used to update software for the fax machines registered.

In addition, users do not use the service to participate in fax transactions. The service is used to update the software application, not actually participate in fax transactions. It is therefore submitted that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claims 2-10 depend from claim 1 and inherently include the elements of claim 1. The prior art does not teach the limitations of claim 1, as discussed above, much less the further features of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that claims 2-10 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claim 17 has been amended to include the same requirement as claim 1. It is therefore submitted that claim 17 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art for the reasons as applied to claim 1, and allowance of claim 17 is requested.

Claim 18-19 depend from claim 17 and include the limitations of claim 17. The prior art does not teach the limitations of claim 17, much less the further limitations of claims 18-19. It is therefore submitted that claims 18-19 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 11-16 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Bloomfield (US Patent No. 6,025,931).

Bloomfield teaches a fax forwarding system where a user may have faxes forwarded to their e-mail address. There is no centralized, user-registered fax service, and the information collected is not by the fax service. The users do not register with a centralized fax service as in the instant application as claimed in claim 11. It is therefore submitted that claim 11 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claims 12-17 depend from claim 11 and therefore include the requirements of the base claim, which is patentably distinguishable for the reasons as discussed above. The prior art does not teach the limitations of the base claim nor the features of the dependent claim. It is therefore submitted that claims 12-17 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon has been reviewed and is not considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 20575

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Julie L. Reed

Julie L. Reed
Reg. No. 35,349

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM
1030 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205
(503) 222-3613